

Interview Summary

Application No.

09/559,347

Applicant(s)

CHEN ET AL.

Examiner

Kevin M Bernatz

Art Unit

1773

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Kevin M Bernatz.

(3) _____.

(2) Raj Dave.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 26 July 2002.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: N/A.

Identification of prior art discussed: Ross et al..

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.


Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview(if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant indicated that a declaration from the author of the Ross et al. patent would be possible, but that no experimental data could be obtained because the laser used in the Ross et al. patent was no longer available. The examiner indicated that any declaration would be considered, but that a declaration providing evidence in the form of data would be the only declaration that could be guaranteed to be convincing. Any declaration not providing data as evidence would have to be reviewed and considered before a determination on patentability could be made.